

"unspecified," "specified," "predetermined," and "positional," as recited in claims 2, 4, 7, and 10, without the terms explicitly recited or defined in the specification.

Regarding the term "document," as recited in claims 12-16, Applicants respectfully assert that "document" has a commonly accepted meaning to those of ordinary skill in the art, and thus, should be examined on the merits.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §112, second paragraph, rejection.

II. 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Shear (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,721); rejects claims 3-4 and 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shear in view of Teng (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138577); and rejects claims 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shear in view of Teng and further in view of Shrader (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,341). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 1 and 5

Specifically, regarding the §102(b) rejection of independent claims 1 and 5, Applicants assert that Shear, Teng, and Shrader, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest an information processor including at least a selection unit for selecting one of a first signature key certified by a first certificate authority and a second signature key certified by a second certificate authority for signing instruction data having a process description for instructing a job process or data to be processed in a job process, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 5.

Shear, in col. 5, lines 43-47, merely discloses that a verifying authority may digitally sign or certify only those load modules or other executables having proper specifications and may include the specifications as part of the material being signed or certified. Shear,

however, fails to disclose an information processor including at least a selection unit for selecting one of a first signature key certified by a first certificate authority and a second signature key certified by a second certificate authority, as recited in claims 1 and 5.

Teng and Shrader also fail to disclose the above feature, and therefore, fail to make up for the deficiencies of Shear.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Shear, Teng, and Shrader, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in independent claims 1 and 5.

Claims 6, 8, 9, and 11

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of independent claims 6, 8, 9, and 11, Applicants assert that Shear, Teng, and Shrader, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a job processor including at least a judging unit for judging whether or not the next job processor is a device within the network, and a signature processor unit for electronically signing the output job flow instruction data using the signature key for the inside when the next job processor is a device within the network and using the signature key for the outside otherwise, as recited in independent claims 6 and 9 and similarly recited in independent claims 8 and 11.

Shear, in col. 10, lines 54-56, merely discloses that once verifying authority is satisfied with load module, it affixes its digital seal of approval to the load module. Shear, however, fails to disclose a job processor including at least a judging unit and a signature processor unit, as recited in claims 6, 8, 9, and 11.

Teng, in paragraph [0192], merely discloses that the user specifies a domain in a directory to associate with a workflow. Teng, however, also fails to disclose a job processor including at least a judging unit and a signature processor unit, as recited in claims 6, 8, 9, and 11.

Shrader also fails to disclose a job processor including at least a judging unit and a signature processor unit, as recited in claims 6, 8, 9, and 11, and therefore, fails to make up for the deficiencies of Shear and Teng.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Shear, Teng, and Shrader, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in independent claims 6, 8, 9, and 11.

Claims 12, 14, 15, and 16

Regarding the §103(a) rejection of independent claims 12, 14, 15, and 16, Applicants assert that Shear, Teng, and Shrader, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a proxy device including at least a first signature conversion unit for, when it is determined in the verification by the first verification unit that the electronic signature attached to the document is signed using a signature key for the internal network, deleting the electronic signature from the document, re-attaching an electronic signature to the document using a signature key of the proxy device for the external network, as recited in independent claims 12 and 15 and similarly recited in independent claims 14 and 16.

Shear, in col. 9, lines 58-64, merely discloses a protected processing environment that can distinguish between authorized and unauthorized load modules by examining the load module to see whether it bears the seal of verifying authority, and that will execute the load module with its processor only if the load module bears a verifying authority's seal. Shear, however, fails to disclose a proxy device including at least a first signature conversion unit for, when it is determined in the verification by the first verification unit that the electronic signature attached to the document is signed using a signature key for the internal network, deleting the electronic signature from the document, re-attaching an electronic signature to the document using a signature key of the proxy device for the external network, as recited in claims 12, 14, 15, and 16.

Teng, in paragraph [0133], merely discloses that a database proxy is created to service a particular database request. Teng, however, also fails to disclose a proxy device including at least a first signature conversion unit for deleting the electronic signature from the document and re-attaching an electronic signature to the document, as recited in claims 12, 14, 15, and 16.

Shrader also fails to disclose all of the features recited in claims 12, 14, 15, and 16, and therefore, fails to make up for the deficiencies of Shear and Teng.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Shear, Teng, and Shrader, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in independent claims 12, 14, 15, and 16.

III. Conclusion

In accordance with the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 5-6, 8-9, 11-12, and 14-16 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-4, 7, 10, and 13 depend from claims 1, 6, 9, and 12, respectively, and therefore, also define patentable subject matter, as well as for the additional features they recite. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Bogdan A. Zinchenko
Registration No. 57,473

JAO:BAZ/hs

Date: October 25, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--